

REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 2-27 are pending. Claims 2-27 are added and claim 1 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The specification as filed provides support for the added claims. Thus, no new matter is added.

In view of the foregoing Amendment and following Remarks, allowance of the pending claims is requested.

Substitute Specification

On October 10, 2003, the Initial Patent Examination Division sent to the Applicants a Notice to File Corrected Application Papers requesting the filing of a substitute specification. This notice was presumably sent because claim 1, as originally filed, was not double-spaced. In response to this requirement, on January 7, 2004, previous counsel submitted a document that, while apparently related to the above-captioned application, did not appear to comply with the Initial Patent Examination Division's request. Nonetheless, Examination on the merits proceeded, as evidenced by the Examiner's Office Action mailed January 9, 2006 ("January 2006 Office Action").

For the sake of clarity, Applicants submit herewith a new substitute specification based on the specification as originally filed on July 14, 2003. A clean copy of the new substitute specification is submitted herewith as "Attachment A." A marked-up version of the new substitute specification is also enclosed as "Attachment B." The marked-up copy of the new substitute specification shows changes relative to the specification as originally filed on July 14, 2003, not relative to the document submitted on January 7, 2004.

The new substitute specification contains no new matter. This new substitute specification includes a Brief Description of the Drawings, the lack of which was objected to by the Examiner in the January 2006 Office Action. The new substitute specification also includes the originally filed claim 1, double spaced as well as heading, formatting and spelling corrections.

The foregoing amendment to the claims cancels claim 1 without prejudice or disclaimer and adds new claims 2-27. The new substitute specification does not reflect

these amendments to the claims. They are reflected only in the Listing of Claims above.

Corrected Drawings

A Replacement Sheet containing amended FIGS. 1 and 2 is submitted herewith as "Attachment C." Both FIG. 1 and FIG. 2, are supported by the figure accompanying the application as originally filed on July 14, 2003 and only add the labels "FIG. 1" and "FIG. 2".

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious in light of U.S. Patent No. 6,391,444 to Aggarwal et al. ("Aggarwal"), in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030110215 by Joao ("Joao"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,632 to Kikugawa ("Kikugawa"). Applicant disagrees with these rejections because the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness. However, Applicants have cancelled claim 1 without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection of claim 1 moot.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 2-27, of which claims 2 and 15 are independent claims. Independent claims 2 and 15 are patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner in the above-mentioned rejection of claim 1 for at least the reason that the references relied upon by the Examiner do not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 2 or 15.

For example, Aggarwal does not disclose, teach, or suggest, a first filter that validates group description data of a candidate group, whereupon the candidate group becomes one of a plurality of validated groups. At best, Aggarwal provides instructors "with authorization privileges on [a] server, to schedule classes." Aggarwal, col. 4, ll. 66-67. This is not validation of description data of a candidate group, as recited in claims 2 and 15. The addition of Joao and Kikugawa does not cure this deficiency.

Claims 3-14 and 16-27 depend from and add features to one of claims 1 or 15. Thus these claims are likewise patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner to reject originally filed claim 1.


CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing objections and rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: **July 7, 2006**

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Timothy C. Rooney
Registration No. 55,878

Customer No. 00909

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Main: 703.770.7900
Direct Dial: 703.770.7939
Fax: 703.770.7901